Approved For Release 2005/08/15 CIA-RDP82-00357R000200080026-8

DDS&T 5082-78

2 5 OCT 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

SUBJECT

: Follow up

29-30 September

25X1

REFERENCE

: DDCI Memo dated 5 October 78, re

Evaluation/Fitness Report

Attached are comments similar to those forwarded to the Secretary/Executive Advisory Group on 28 September concerning paragraph II. A of reference. We have no additional substantive comments to offer at this time on the redesign of the appraisal form. We do feel, however, that regardless of the final version of this form, a comprehensive training program on performance appraisal in general will be necessary if the Agency is to achieve the desired improvements in this process.

A-LESLIE C. DIRKS

for Science and Technology

Deputy Director

Attachment

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/08/15 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200080026-8

DDS&T 5082-78 Attachment

A. Work Objectives, Goals & Priorities

The DDS&T endorses the principle of work planning. Current DDS&T policy recommends the use of the Letter of Instruction (LOI) as a management tool on an optional but not mandatory basis. This policy is based on the recognition that the tasks associated with some positions don't lend themselves to an annual, goal-oriented, definitive description and that some supervisors and managers are so skilled in their frequent dealings with subordinates that a written work plan would contribute little in relation to the time and effort required to administrer it. However, implementation of a formal work planning program, if not overly detailed, would probably benefit most supervisor-subordinate relationships, and it seems logical for it to be an integral part of the performance appraisal process. In considering the mechanics of this process, one way to implement it would be for the supervisor to complete the appraisal of one year's performance and prepare the work plan for the next year's activities at the same time, that is, complete portions of two separate copies of the Performance Appraisal Report at the same time.

B. Regarding changing the point spread in 3-5 years

I am assuming that the purpose in so doing would be to prevent a recurrence of inflated fitness report ratings and to provide a means of ensuring that the ratings are consistently applied. If this is the case, I have no objection. However, I believe we would be in a better position 3-5 years from now in order to judge the effectiveness of the newly proposed system.

C. Justification of each specific duty

As noted in a memorandum to D/Personnel (15 April 78) I am not entirely convinced that it is necessary to require justification of each specific task rating. We would, however, expect a full explanation of the factors leading to an exceptionally low or high rating, but otherwise I believe that this is best left to the discretion of the rating and reviewing officers. We agree that suggestions for improving work performance should be provided.

Approved For Release 2005/08/15: CIA-RDP82-00357R000200080026-8
DDS&T 5082-78
Attachment

D. Employee's Potential

Fitness reports often contain comments regarding employee potential. These comments may pertain to potential in the current position, or potential to perform in other positions at the same or higher grade levels. Certainly the rater and reviewer can make meaningful comments regarding an employee's potential in his current position, or the position of the rater/reviewer as appropriate. However, raters and reviewers generally do not have the knowledge required to make generalizations regarding the potential of an employee to perform in other positions at higher levels. Such comments give the employee a false impression, and may be inconsistent with panel findings.

Recommendations:

Comments regarding the potential of an employee to perform in other positions should be permitted in the Performance Appraisal as long as they do not address specific positions which are not thoroughly familiar to the rater/reviewer. General comments regarding an employee's potential for advancing into one or more types of higher level positions would appear to be most appropriate.